REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1-8, 10-13, and 15-17, and have canceled claims 2 and 6-19, during prosecution of this patent application. Applicants are not conceding in this patent application that said amended and canceled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, since the claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue said amended and canceled claims, and other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the following feature: "compiling the source code into object code, said compiling comprising determining the equivalence of the two algebraic expressions followed by eliminating a redundant algebraic expression of the two algebraic expressions determined to be equivalent". Applicant notes that support for the preceding feature is found in the paragraph beginning on page 5, line 14 of Applicant's specification.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-13 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the rules of Algebra.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-13 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the rules of Algebra.

Since claims 2, 6-8, 10-13, and 15-18 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 2, 6-8, 10-13, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is moot.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 1 is not unpatentable over the rules of algebra, because the rules of algebra does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1.

For example, the rules of algebra do not teach or suggest the feature" compiling the source code into object code, said compiling comprising determining the equivalence of the two algebraic expressions followed by eliminating a redundant algebraic expression of the two algebraic expressions determined to be equivalent".

Applicant respectfully contends that a compiler may use rules of algebra, but there are no rules of algebra that state steps to be performed during compilation of source code into object code.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner produce legally persuasive evidence allegedly demonstrating that the rules of algebra teach or suggest the preceding feature of claim 1.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully maintains that Srivastava does not anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 3-5 depends from claim 1, Applicant respectfully maintains that claims 3-5 are likewise in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully believes that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM).

Date: 06/04/2007

Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive - Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850 Telephone
(518) 220-1857 Facsimile
E-mail: jfriedman@iplawusa.com